

REMARKS

Claims 1-93 are pending in this application. By this amendment, claim 75 is amended. Reconsideration and allowance in view of the following remarks are respectfully requested.

No new matter has been added by this amendment.¹

A. The 35 U.S.C. 112 Rejection

On page 2, the Office Action rejects claims 75-87 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

The Office Action asserts a deficiency in claim 75. By this Amendment, claim 75 is amended in response to the asserted deficiency.

Applicant submits that the claims satisfy 35 U.S.C. 112. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112.

B. The 35 U.S.C. 103 Rejection Based on Levchin and Money

In the Office Action, claims 1-14, 16-21, 23, 24, 26-59, 61-73, 75-86 and 88-93 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levchin et al. (USPN 7089208) in view of "Information Technologies for the Control of Money Laundering", September 1995 (hereinafter referred to as "Money") . Applicant traverses such rejection on multiple grounds as set forth below.

¹ As Applicant's remarks with respect to the Examiner's rejections are sufficient to overcome these rejections, Applicant's silence as to assertions by the Examiner in the Office Action or certain requirements that may be applicable to such rejections (e.g., assertions regarding dependent claims, whether a reference constitutes prior art, whether references are legally combinable for obviousness purposes) is not a concession by Applicant that such assertions are accurate or such requirements have been met, and Applicant reserves the right to analyze and dispute such in the future.

The features of claim 1 are set forth above.

Applicant respectfully submits, for the reasons set forth below, that the Office Action fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. As recited in Section 2142 of the MPEP, to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 2 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

As set forth in M.P.E.P 706.02(j), 35 U.S.C. 103 authorizes a rejection where, to meet the claim, it is necessary to modify a single reference or to combine it with one or more other references. M.P.E.P 706.02(j) indicates that after indicating that the rejection is under 35 U.S.C. 103, the Examiner should set forth in the Office Action:

(A) the relevant teachings of the prior art relied upon, preferably with reference to the relevant column or page number(s) and line number(s) where appropriate,

(B) the difference or differences in the claim over the applied reference(s),

(C) the proposed modification of the applied reference(s) necessary to arrive at the claimed subject matter, and

(D) an explanation why one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to make the proposed modification.

M.P.E.P 706.02(j) references the well known requirements of *Graham v. John Deere*. Further, M.P.E.P 706.02(j) notes that it is important for an Examiner to properly

communicate the basis for a rejection so that the issues can be identified early and the Applicant can be given fair opportunity to reply.

As recited in the M.P.E.P., “To support the conclusion that the claimed invention is directed to obvious subject matter, either the references must expressly or impliedly suggest the claimed invention or the examiner must present a convincing line of reasoning as to why the artisan would have found the claimed invention to have been obvious in light of the teachings of the references.” MPEP 706.02(j).

The rejection sets forth various alleged features of Levchin. Thereafter, on page 4, lines 12-16, the Office Action acknowledges deficiencies of Levchin. Specifically, the Office Action asserts:

Levchin does not explicitly teach wherein in such pushing, payee account number of the another customer, the payee, is transmitted over a network without account information of the first customer, the payor, wherein the pushing of funds, without account information of the first customer, is constituted by the payee not being provided with information such that the payor account is identifiable to the payee.

The Office Action then proposes to cure the acknowledged deficiencies of Levchin with the teachings of Money. That is, the Office Action asserts:

Money teaches the concept of wire transfer mechanism (push-model), such that the **pushing of funds is done without account information of the payee** such that the payee cannot identify the payor account from which the funds are pushed (page 24, paragraphs I and 2, lines 1-20). Therefore, it **would have been obvious** to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to **modify Levchin to include this feature for the obvious reason of keeping the sender's information confidential.**

(emphasis added)

Applicant submits that the motivation provided in the Office Action fails to fairly support the proposed combination. Specifically, Applicant submits that the motivation is based on modifying Levchin to provide features that Levchin already possesses.

That is, Levchin in column 1, lines 34-40, describes features directly related to keeping the information of a person confidential. Specifically, Levchin describes:

Thus, what is needed is a system and method for enabling value transfers without all the shortcomings of existing means and techniques. It would be desirable, for example, to allow a value exchange transaction to be conducted using a known or common identifier of a person (e.g., electronic mail address, telephone number) rather than other, more sensitive, information.

Levchin goes on to describe that digital certificates and a public/private key arrangement may be utilized to protect such sensitive information. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the very basis for modifying Levchin is to provide Levchin with a feature that Levchin already possesses. Applicant respectfully submits that such clearly cannot support the applied 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection.

Further, Applicant respectfully submits that the disclosure of Money fails to support the 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection. As set forth above, the Office Action relies on the teachings on page 24 of Money. Therein, on page 24, Money describes:

Often, as the payment order is reformatted for the next phase of the transfer, the bank will omit identification for earlier participants, such as the sender or intermediate banks. In the United States, the originator's account number has generally been dropped from subsequent payment orders to keep this information confidential. Some foreign banks, if requested, will omit the name of the originator and merely state "payable for our good customer."

(emphasis added)

The teachings of Money goes on to say (on page 24) that - under new regulations to take effect in 1996, identification of the originator and beneficiary is required and must travel with the message throughout the transfer.

Thus, Money is essentially describing that in the series of phases of the transfer - that at some point the originator's account number may be dropped. However, the claimed invention, as recited in claim 1, does not relate to a series of phases of a transfer. Rather, claim 1 relates to

particular processing in which a command is accepted from a first customer to transfer funds from the first customer's account to another customer in a pushing of funds. That is, claim 1 recites:

accepting a command from a first customer to transfer funds from the first customer's electronic payment account to an electronic payment account of another customer; and

transferring the command to the at least one account system; and

the at least one account system **effectuating the commanded transfer of funds**, such effectuating of the commanded transfer of funds including a **pushing** of funds to the electronic payment account of the another customer, the electronic payment account of the another customer being the demand deposit account; and

wherein in **such pushing**, a payee account number of the another customer, the payee, is transmitted over a **network** without account information of the first customer, the payor; and

wherein **the pushing of funds**, without account information of the first customer, is constituted by the payee not being provided with information such that the payor account is identifiable to the payee.

(emphasis added)

Applicant submits that the features of claim 1 precludes the interpretation of the processing of claim 1 being performed over a series of phases, i.e., in one of which the account number is dropped. That is, claim 1 sets forth that the commanded transfer of funds is effected by a pushing of funds. Applicant submits that the claim requires an association between the command from the first customer and the electronic payment account of the another customer, i.e., based on the respective association of each of (1) the command from the first customer and (2) the electronic payment account of the another customer vis-à-vis the claimed "pushing".
Applicant submits that the "phases" interpretation of Money simply does not teach such features. In other words, Money fails to teach or suggest a "pushing" of funds with the particulars, and the claimed interrelationship, as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that the interpretation as set forth in the Office Action is strained and cannot fairly support the applied 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103 is respectfully requested. Further, independent claims 43, 61, and 75 recite patentable subject matter at least for reasons similar to those set forth above with respect to claim 1.

The dependent claims recite patentable subject matter based on their dependencies on the respective independent claims, as well as for the additional features such dependent claims recite. Withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103 rejection is respectfully requested.

C. The Further 35 U.S.C. 103 Rejections

In the Office Action, on page 12, claims 60, 74, and 87 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levchin in view of Money, as applied above, and further in view of Magness (USPN 6769605). Also, claims 15, 22, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levchin in view of Money, as applied above, and further in view of Drummond et al (USPN 7080036).

Applicant submits that the further modification of Levchin based on the teachings of Magness and/or Drummond fails to cure the deficiencies of the rejection, as discussed above. That is, Applicant submits that even if it were obvious to further modify Levchin (as proposed modified by Money) based on the teachings of Magness and/or Drummond as asserted in the Office Action, which is not admitted by Applicant, such combination of applied art would still fail to fairly teach or suggest the claimed invention.

Applicant submits that such rejected dependent claims recite patentable subject matter for at least reasons similar to those set forth above, as well as the additional features such dependent claims recite.

Withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection is requested.

D. Conclusion

For at least the reasons outlined above, Applicant respectfully asserts that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully solicited.

For any fees due in connection with filing this Response the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the undersigned's Deposit Account No. 50-0206.

Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place the application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP

Date: MARCH 8, 2010

By: _____
James R. Miner
Registration No. 40,444

Hunton & Williams LLP
Intellectual Property Department
1900 K Street, N.W.
Suite 1200
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 955-1500 (telephone)
(202) 778-2201 (facsimile)